



**SCHIFFRIN BARROWAY
TOPAZ & KESSLER, LLP**
Attorneys at Law

www.sbtclaw.com

2125 Oak Grove Road, Suite 120 • Walnut Creek, California 94598 • (925) 945-0770 • Fax: (925) 945-8792
280 King of Prussia Road • Radnor, Pennsylvania 19087 • (610) 667-7706 • Fax: (610) 667-7056

E-Mail: aplutzik@sbtclaw.com

July 12, 2007

VIA E-FILING

The Honorable Ronald M. Whyte
United States District Court for the Northern District of California
San Jose Division
280 South 1st Street
Courtroom 6, 4th Floor
San Jose, CA 95113

Re: Extreme Networks, Inc. Derivative Litigation
Yenna Wu v. Gordon L. Stitt, et al. Case No. C-07-02268-RMW
Linda Erikson v. Gordon L. Stitt, et al. Case No. C-07-02388-RMW
Frank A. Grucel v. Gordon L. Stitt, et al. Case No. C-07-02848-RMW

Dear Judge Whyte:

I am of counsel to the law firm Schiffrin Barroway Topaz & Kessler, LLP ("Schiffrin Barroway"), counsel for plaintiffs Yenna Wu ("Wu") and Linda Erikson ("Erikson") in *Wu v. Stitt et al.*, Case No. C-07-02268-RMW, and *Erikson v. Stitt*, Case No. C-07-02388-RMW, respectively. Plaintiffs Wu and Erikson have filed a motion requesting the Court to consolidate the three pending related actions listed above, appoint them as lead plaintiffs, and approve their counsel, my law firm, as lead counsel in the three related actions (the "Wu/Erikson Motion"), which is set for hearing before Your Honor on August 17, 2007. There is also a pending motion filed by Frank A. Grucel, plaintiff in *Grucel v. Stitt*, Case No. C-07-02848-RMW, seeking consolidation, appointment as lead plaintiff and approval of his choice of counsel, the firm of Lerach Coughlin Geller Rudman Stoia & Robbins LLP, as lead counsel (the "Grucel Motion"), which is set for hearing before Your Honor on July 27, 2007. Since both of these motions relate to the same three related cases, I write to respectfully request that the Court move the hearing on the Grucel Motion to August 17, 2007, and hear both motions together.

The Wu/Erikson motion was filed on July 10, 2007. However, due to an administrative error over confusion with the re-noticing of the hearing in the *Grucel* action for July 27, 2007, following the reassignment of the case from Magistrate Judge Lloyd to Your Honor, plaintiffs Wu and Erikson failed to file a response to the Grucel Motion by July 6, 2007, as required by the

Hon. Ronald M. Whyte
July 12, 2007
Page Two

Northern District's local rules. Additionally, plaintiffs Wu, Erikson and Grucel and defendants agreed by stipulation filed July 11, 2007 to the consolidation of the actions.

Although defendants are amenable to extending the date of the hearing to consolidate and appoint lead plaintiff and lead counsel to August 17, 2007, plaintiff Grucel's counsel has not responded to any of our repeated requests to schedule the hearing in all cases for that date. We submit that judicial economy plainly would be served by hearing these matters together, and would eliminate the prejudice that all plaintiffs might suffer in the event the motions are heard on different dates.

Respectfully submitted,

SCHIFFRIN BARROWAY
TOPAZ & KESSLER, LLP

/s/ Alan R. Plutzik

ARP/JDA

Alan R. Plutzik (Cal. Bar No. 077785)